In The Matter Of:

East Chicago Waterway Board of Directors Meeting

April 16, 2014

Iseminger & Associates, Inc.
Professional Court Reporters
14 Indiana Ave., Suite A - Valparaiso, IN 46383
Toll Free: 877.Dep.Rep9
E-Mail: in_courtreporters@yahoo.com

Original File EC-BOARD-14.txt

Min-U-Script® with Word Index

EAST CHICAGO WATERWAY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT BOARD OF DIRECTORS' MEETING City of East Chicago, Engineering/Annex Building 4444 Railroad Ave. East Chicago, Indiana April 16, 2014 Wednesday, 5:00 P.M. Transcript of the proceedings had in the above-entitled matter, on the 16th day of April, 2014, at 5:00 p.m., at the City of East Chicago, Engineering/Annex Building, 4444 Railroad Avenue, East Chicago, Indiana, before Dawn M. Iseminger, Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public for the County of Porter, State of Indiana.

1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	MR. JOHN FEKETE, President
4	MR. RAY LOPEZ, Secretary
5	MR. HENRY RODRIGUEZ, Board Member
6	MR. JOHN BAKOTA, Board Member
7	MR. MIKE EBERT, Board Member
8	MR. EARNEST JONES, Board Member
9	MR. RICH GOMEZ, Board Member
10	MR. FERNANDO TREVINO, FMT Consulting
11	MS. ELLEN GREGORY, East Chicago Waterway Board of
12	Directors' Attorney
13	
14	Also Present:
15	TIM ANDERSON, CliftonLarsonAllen
16	TOM BARNETT, ArcelorMittal
17	DAN BANASZEK, URS
18	JIM WESCOTT, Tetra Tech
19	DAVID ALONZO, B.M.O. Harris
20	NATALIE MILLS, USACE
21	PAUL CZAPHOWICZ, THE TIMES
22	SCOTT IRELAND, US EPA
23	
24	
25	

1 MR. FEKETE: I'd like to call to order the East Chicago waterway management board of 2 3 directors' meeting of April 16, 2014. order of business is roll call. Mike Ebert? 4 MR. EBERT: Here. 5 MR. FEKETE: John Bakota? MR. BAKOTA: Here. 7 MR. FEKETE: Ray Lopez? 8 9 MR. LOPEZ: Here 10 MR. FEKETE: John Fekete, here. 11 Earnest Jones? 12 MR. JONES: Here. 13 MR. FEKETE: Henry Rodriguez? 14 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Here. 15 MR. JONES: We have a quorum. 16 MR. FEKETE: Engineering, Mr. Trevino 17 MR. TREVINO: Fernando Trevino, F.M.T 18 Consulting. Start off with the contents of your 19 packet. You have board minutes dated March 19, 20 2014, for approval consideration. You have in 21 your packet the financial statements from 22 CliftonLarson dated March 31, 2014; and the accounts payable vouchers dated April 16, 2014, on 23 24 the agenda for approval consideration. You have user fee deposit memos dated March 12, 17, 18, 24, 25

25

April 1st, April 4th, and April 14, all of 2014. And those reflect the user fee payments that have been received to date, 2014. You have in your packet a First Merchants Bank statement for the month of March, 2014, for account ending in 608, and ending in account 616. You have the B.M.O. Harris Bank ECI Facility Trust report dated April 16, 2014. You have B.M.O. Harris brokerage account statement for account ending in 534 for the month of March, 2014. You have March not April. You have Northwest Indiana Times article titled, "NIRPC kicking off application process for trails, " dated April 1, 2014, and another article, also from The Times, regarding the BP Refinery oil spill, and that was dated March 31, 2014. have an e-mail and attached information from Caitlin McCoy dated March 26, 2014, regarding the Grand Cal, with a map. You have in your packet Tetra Tech report, dated April 8, 2014, and it includes the progress report, schedule, budget, and the invoice. You have a Department of the Army memo dated March 13, 2014, regarding the monthly monitoring report for the Indiana Harbor and Canal Confined Disposal Facility, and regarding the NPDES permit ending in 511, for the

month of February, 2014.

And you have the Army Corps of Engineer monthly progress report to the board, dated April 15, 2014. You have in your packet "Options to Consider for Addressing Non-participating Board Members," and this was as a result of board concerns in the event there's a Waterway Management District Board member who is not participating. This is an option for the board to consider, and if the board wishes and likes this proposal, it would be made part of the bylaws. Bylaw amendment would be required, and the date of this is April 16, 2014.

And last, but not least, you have the Attorney Ellen Gregory report next, dated April 15, 2014. I'd like to give an update on a couple projects and activities. Great Lakes Legacy Act had a meeting with Mr. Jim Wescott and Scott Ireland regarding the remedial investigation feasibility work plan and discussed questions and comments on the plan, and the final plan should be out within the next week. Some of the things that the plan included was property access to the canal and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

river, utility clearances. Also included in the plan was some of the concerns from the board to make sure that any contamination source controls were identified and eliminated prior to remediation. The evaluation of the sediment trap, also a community engagement component, and the review of the canal and river bank integrity. Mr. Jim Wescott and Scott Ireland are present today. Mr. Wescott will give an update and he is on the agenda, so if there's any questions for either gentlemen, we could entertain them from that time. current dredging schedule is to begin April 21, 2014, and Army Corps of Engineer, Natalie Mills, can give us an update if that date is still a good date for the start of dredging. User fees, I mentioned that the deposit memos were in your packet. Total collected through 2014 is \$235,000. I met with First Merchant Bank reps, either last week or the week before, and just to discuss the transition issues between First Merchant and Citizens Bank. estate easements, I know the research continues regarding real estate. ACDF appraisal meeting is tentatively scheduled for April 29th, and

1	Attorney Ellen Gregory can give us a more
2	detailed update on that and other legal matters
3	during her report. Also, for the next board
4	meeting, I hope to have a cost estimate for
5	getting each board member an iPad, and that
6	will help for more effective communication and
7	board meeting participation. And that
8	concludes my report.
9	MR. FEKETE: Are there any questions for
10	Mr. Trevino?
11	(No response.)
12	MR. FEKETE: Thank you very much.
13	The next order of business is the approval
14	consideration of the board meeting notes for
15	March 19th.
16	MR. LOPEZ: Motion to accept:
17	MR. BAKOTA: Second.
18	MR. FEKETE: I'll take a vote. I would like
19	to make one correction, Mr. Weezer is W-i-e-s-e-r.
20	Okay. With that correction, I'll just call
21	for a voice vote. All in favor of the motion.
22	(All signify aye.)
23	MR. FEKETE: Opposed?
24	(No response.)
25	MR. FEKETE: Board meeting minute notes have

been approved as amended. The accounting consultant report, financials, Mr. Anderson

MR. ANDERSON: Tim Anderson,
CliftonLarsonAllen. In your board packet you have
the financial statement that we did through March.
Page 2 of that report shows the cash receipts that
we've received through March, reimbursement from
the trusts and the user fees. And then there's
the list of the disbursements that we've made,
January, February, and March. So our cash has
increased 285,000 between the operating account
and the user fee account. So the total of those
two accounts at the end of March was 1.9.

Page 3 shows the activity within those two accounts that we have. The operating account, we cut the checks. In the user fee account, we deposit the user fees and we made the budget transfer to the operating account.

MR. FEKETE: Uh-huh.

MR. ANDERSON: So there's a million in the operating account and there's 878 in the user fee account through March.

Page 4, I changed a little bit. It's still tiny, I know. I'll fix that. But I thought it was important for you guys to see

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the checks that you're signing today off of that budget. So I included -- and I'm going to do this going forward -- I'm going to include a column that shows what you're signing today so that you know that we're not exceeding the available budget with the checks that you have in your packet today. So through April, we've expended -- well, starting over on the left-hand column, we see the total budget that we had for '14. We get to add the accounts payable to it from last year, so the total appropriation was 1.185, and then you see each month as we write the checks, and now this last column will include the checks that you have today, so we have a million 47 left of our budget for this fiscal year. Any questions? I see how Fernando copies a portrait like that: Maybe I can give you -- I can give you a landscape and that will be easier to read. Because we don't print it really small so you don't look at it; that's not the idea.

MR. FEKETE: Are there any questions for Mr. Anderson? I'm sorry, were you done?

MR. ANDERSON: That's it. Thank you.

MR. FEKETE: No questions. Thank you very

1	much. We have the accounts payable voucher that
2	Mr. Anderson presented to us.
3	MR. LOPEZ: Motion to accept.
4	MR. FEKETE: I will entertain a motion to pay
5	the voucher as presented. We have a motion.
6	MR. EBERT: Second.
7	MR. FEKETE: We have a second. I'll
8	entertain a roll call vote. Mr. Ebert?
9	MR. EBERT: Yes
10	MR. FEKETE: Mr. Bakota?
11	MR. BAKOTA: Yes.
12	MR. FEKETE: Mr. Rodriguez?
13	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.
14	MR. FEKETE: Mr. Lopez?
15	MR. LOPEZ: Yes.
16	MR. FEKETE: Mr. Fekete, yes. Mr. Jones?
17	(No response.)
18	MR. FEKETE: Okay. Approved B.M.O. Harris
19	Bank trust report
20	MR. ALONZO: David Alonzo with B.M.O. Harris.
21	We can go through our report. The first page just
22	gives us the historical values for the last 16 or
23	17 years of the account history and then
24	distributions. Page 2, the value of the trust on
25	April 15th was \$5,949,854. That was a difference

1 from the last meeting of a negative \$231,542. course, that difference was -- if you go over the 2 3 next column -- the distribution for the year was \$234,110. Those numbers are not the same. They're negative from the last meeting and that's 5 because there was some interest that was earned 6 7 that made up for a little bit of the distribution. And since 1997, we've disbursed \$18,492,000 from 8 9 the trust Page 3 will give us a detail of the accounts. One thing to keep in mind here is the 10 11 one in yellow is the CD that is maturing. 12 other thing to look at would be the prime money 13 market, which has a balance of 332,222. typically like to keep 500,000 in that account. 14 15 The distribution we made did come out of that 16 money market, which is why it's less than what we want it to be. We will have some interest that 17 will be posting to the trust from three CDs this 18 Two will be credit interest on the 19th of 19 month. the month and one will be on the 29th. 20 21 next meeting, we'll see a jump in the deposit amount for how much we made for the month. 22 when we look at that yellow CD, you know, during 23 our finance committee meeting I made the 24 recommendation based on the current interest rate 25

1	environment that once this CD matures on April
2	19th to move \$167,778 from that maturing CD.
3	We'll backfill that money market to bring it back
4	up to \$500,000, as we've always had it; and then
5	the remaining amount of that CD will go into a
6	three-year certificate at .9 percent. Again, the
7	bank will work with you guys to give you a little
8	bit better interest rate from where our current
9	rates are standing right now. So that was the
10	recommendation I had made. Any questions on that?
11	MR. LOPEZ: Make the motion.
12	MR. FEKETE: We need a motion.
13	MR. LOPEZ: I make a motion that we accept
14	the recommendation.
15	MR. BAKOTA: Second.
16	MR. FEKETE: We will have roll call on that
17	Mr. Ebert?
18	MR. EBERT: Yes
19	MR. FEKETE: Mr. Bakota?
20	MR. BAKOTA: Yes.
21	MR. FEKETE: Mr. Rodriguez?
22	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.
23	MR. FEKETE: Mr. Lopez?
24	MR. LOPEZ: Yes.
25	MR. FEKETE: Mr. Fekete; I vote yes. The

1 recommendation is approved. MR. ALONZO: Next year we'll have two CD's 2 3 coming due, so up until next June, we don't have any CD's to worry about maturing. 5 MR. FEKETE: Very good. 6 MR. TREVINO: And, Mr. Fekete, this is the 7 letter of direction that reflects the recommendation. It requires your signature 8 9 MR. FEKETE: Thank you. Do we have somebody here from First --10 11 MR. TREVINO: No. While we were meeting earlier, I had a missed call, and I checked my 12 13 e-mail just now, and I got an e-mail from the representative of First Merchants that he wouldn't 14 15 be able to make it. 16 MR. FEKETE: The next order of business is the Great Lakes Legacy Act update. 17 MR. WESCOTT: Jim Wescott from Tetra Tech 18 Fernando sort of gave you a brief update of where 19 20 we're at. We're continuing to look at the historical documents. For instance, you know, 2.1 22 we're looking at using the south tank farm, potentially, for some of the actual construction 23 24 activity, and then we're also looking at a piece

of property owned by the City of East Chicago,

which apparently is called the City Dump, which is right where the east and west branch come together. So we're seeing if there are any issues with those pieces of property. Then we'll continue to have conversations with the property owners for the next year as we sort this out.

That's one of the things that we've done.

We also are in the process of finalizing the work plan for what we want to do in the field. We're -- there's several activities, sediment sampling, source control evaluation, looking at slope stability along Indiana Harbor Canal, the Grand Cal, Lake George Canal.

The first thing that we'll probably need to get done is the bathymetric survey of the non-navigation part of the river. The expectation is that EPA will pay for a lot of the fieldwork as part of their match. One thing that I'll probably talk to Fernando and the EPA representative in the next few days, is because, you know, we want to get the fieldwork going, you know, by late spring as the water levels come up. But EPA may be lagging. So we may be trying to see if I can fit a little bit of the fieldwork, just the

survey in, maybe. I think I can make it work.

But I need to have a conversation with him to
see if we can at least get going, because the
bathymetric survey will dry where some of the
sediment sampling points are based on the
height of the sediment.

MR. BAKOTA: What is that survey; what does it consist of?

MR. WESCOTT: Basically, it's a boat with some monitors, and they go up and down the river and use sonar to kind of map the bottom of the channel basically. So we just need to kind of know how deep the sediment is and that will kind of drive a lot of the work that comes after that.

MR. BAKOTA: What's the hope on the depth?

MR. WESCOTT: The hope would be it's a
hundred feet deep. The driver is, you know, if
it's deep -- let's say it's five-foot or more in
depth, the potential would be that we don't have
to dredge some of these areas. We may just go in
and cap it and cover up the dirty stuff. If it's
too shallow, though, we need to dredge some,
because if we don't dredge and cap, you know,
there's no water left and so canoers and kayakers
can't use the river. So we want to maintain --

like right now, like three feet of the water. 1 in the summertime you're looking at four or five 2 feet of water at a minimum so that you can get 3 potentially, down the road, recreational use and 4 the ecosystem. If it's too shallow, it doesn't 5 make any sense. 6 Can I ask, has there ever been a 7 MR. BAKOTA: study or can it be determined how much sediment 8 9 comes through the Grand Calumet River into the ship canal and at least into the ship canal. 10 MR. WESCOTT: We will actually do that. 11 Fernando mentioned, I think it's in -- one of your 12 13 interests is looking at a sediment trap. 14 MR. BAKOTA: Yeah. 15 MR. WESCOTT: Right. So as part of that modeling, we'll -- I mean, we're not going to be 16 17 able to tell you the pound, but we'll be able 18 to -- you know, we're going to take measurements 19 in both the east branch and west branch and do 20 some modeling to try to get a general idea how 21 much sediment is coming out of that river and into the Indiana Harbor Canal. 22 23 MR. BAKOTA: Do they also consider velocity 24 of the water during seasons?

MR. WESCOTT: Yes; there are a number of

different parameters that go into the -- and then

Mr. Ireland can come into my space because it is a

partnership.

MR. IRELAND: Scott Ireland, U.S. EPA, Great Lakes National Program office. The Corps of Engineers did a study that talked about how much was going out into the lake annually from the ship canal that came from the river. I think that was done in the late '80s, early '90s. They haven't updated that since then. But what Mr. Wescott talked about, is we're going to be able to get some information on what the flow is. We can do some backing out, we'll have to figure out how much material that is taking and what the concentrations are, but it's not going to be a real exact thing, but we can basically come up with some numbers of how much we would see go out and how much we would see drop out into a sediment trap.

MR. BAKOTA: Because some years ago I remember they had a -- I don't know if it was an aerial or a satellite view of the plume going out and it went out quite a distance:

MR. IRELAND: Yeah. We see that a lot.
MR. BAKOTA: It was thousands of yards a year

25

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

that were washed out of the canal. 1 MR. IRELAND: We see that a lot with 2 I was looking at one from 3 satellite shots now. the Duluth flooding in 2012. They have a 4 satellite image of sediment just pouring out of 5 the canal there. 6 7 It's impressive when you see MR. BAKOTA: that 8 9 MR IRELAND: Yeah. And, you know, all the sediment or bound contaminants are just then going 10 11 out into the lake which are nonrecoverable at that point. 12 13 MR. BAKOTA: I think this even reached the 14 Hammond intake. I don't know if that was 15 consistent or that was a --16 MR. IRELAND: I don't know the extent of what 17 it does during a normal event, but we're seeing more non-normal events as we move forward. 18 19 MR. WESCOTT: So as you look ahead on the 20 schedule, the expectation is the fieldwork will 21 occur May through the fall, depending on some 22 timing issues. So we can get most of the data 23 collected by September/October and then get the 24 remedial investigation report and the feasibility

study done by the end of the calendar year so that

we can go into design next calendar year, so that by mid to late -- well, late summer, early fall, there's a design complete that EPA can then contract out. And there are a lot of balls in the air right now with BP and their work on the south tank farm and sort of shifting priorities, so I'm trying to stay very flexible working with Fernando and EPA to make this kind of come together. there are opportunities, shorter-term opportunities that we can take advantage of like low hanging fruit, we'll do that, but, otherwise, we'll drive on and try to get a design done so some construction can occur in 2016. That's sort of the long-term plan and it's all contingent on funding ...

MR. LOPEZ: 2016?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. WESCOTT: That would be my plan and I know -- if we can get something in 2015 that's achievable, we'll try. Right now it's early and there's -- we're optimistic.

MR. IRELAND: This is Scott again. As we've talked in the past, we're talking about three distinct chunks that we're analyzing, and as we go along with their feasibility study, the remedial investigation, if it becomes apparent that we may

25

have additional partners to do remedial action in any one of those three, we can break that off and move that a little bit faster, so we do have some flexibility, and as Mr. Wescott talked about, we have -- there's a lot of things up in the air. try to make sure that we dovetail as we move He talked about some, I don't know if it Right now we're looking at trying to was lagging. find our best avenue to do -- the sediment collection is going to be on our plate. trying to work on getting the best contract to do that, so weire working through that. partnership seems to be, as I would have expected, going very well. One of the things we are currently working on is developing our cohesive project team that we're going to meet with on a regular basis, and then as we move forward, regular conversations will be had. One of the things we're going to start very soon on is discussions on the public outreach, the public output component. One of the things we do on the Great Lakes Legacy Act is we have project cost and program cost. Our public outreach is something we do at all sites, so that's a program cost we bear as a federal agency at a hundred percent.

25

we set up a public availability session, if we develop fact sheets, we do that on our own, but we make sure that we incorporate the partners and everybody's input as we go forward. That's not a project cost that you guys have to bear. So we're going to be talking about what that's going to look like as we move forward. Normally, for these type of projects, we don't start that process until we get toward -- closer to the remedial action point, but for this type of an activity, as many things as we've got going on, I want to start thinking proactively about what a fact sheet is going to look like. What a public availability session would look like. We usually don't have public meetings, because we're not standing up there talking. We call them "public availability sessions" for people to come in and talk to us and see pictures and things of what it's going to look like. So start getting some input from the public on what this is going to look like as we move forward, what to expect when people are out there sampling, and what to expect when people are out there doing the dredging and other things. those are the kind of things we're going to be working on as we move forward.

22

23

24

25

MR. WESCOTT: It would be helpful to kind of tie in with what you were talking earlier about Roxanna Marsh and, you know, agencies don't even know what's going on, and I think we just need to get sort of the message out so that -- there's a lot of work going on on the Grand Cal and there's been a lot of improvement, but I still don't think there is recognition of how it all comes together and the opportunity that that provides. think if EPA, working with Fernando and the board, can kind of get a little more notoriety or just visibility, you know, for the opportunity, then other things will -- other people will come forward, other stakeholders. I think there will be opportunities to leverage what's been done and what is currently going on both in the non-navigation part and the Corps work on the navigation section to kind of move it -- move the ball down the field a little bit more.

MR. FEKETE: My perspective on this whole thing is there's so much pent up energy that's been accumulating over a long period of time, that all of a sudden there's opportunities to actually get things done and it's just kind of exploding, and I want to make sure that all of these ideas

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and groups that are working together work synergistically rather than independently.

MR. IRELAND: I'm a hundred percent on board with that because I don't want to hear at the end of the day someone say, Well you should have contacted me because I've got ideas and I've got money. That's something I don't want to hear after the fact. One of the things I can't stress enough is as we move forward with the remedial investigation, the feasibility study, from a City's perspective, start thinking of what you want to see in areas long term with the properties you own, so if you have an idea for a parcel of property that's adjacent to the river canal, what you have an idea for that will factor into what we design as far as remediation or other opportunities. So, you know, we can kind of tailor things as we move forward. If you want a boat dock or you want something, we can factor We don't want to come in after the fact and say, Wow, if we'd just thought of doing something here, we could have done this here. So start thinking proactively. We've got a couple years just as we roll this forward, and I want to make sure that, you know, we've got adjacent

1	wetlands, we've got, you know, non-nav parts of
2	the ship canal, let's make sure that we're all on
3	the same page with moving forward with what we can
4	that, you know, meets the regulatory requirements
5	of the state as far as what permits can be had and
6	then what the city would like to see moving
7	forward.
8	MR. WESCOTT: Right. Not to drag it out but
9	one thing we talked with Fernando at the meeting
10	you mentioned was, like, just for this field
11	investigation work, one of the real difficult
12	things is just finding places to put a boat in the
13	water, right, because there's no access. So one
14	thing to start thinking about is, like, parcels
15	for, like, a canoe launch or a kayak launch,
16	because it's really hard to get to the river
17	MR. BAKOTA: Yeah.
18	MR. WESCOTT: There's a few locations but if
19	you're going to spend a lot of money cleaning it
20	up and then you can't get to it, you know, it's
21	hard to do when
22	MR. BAKOTA: We're talking about public
23	access.
24	MR. IRELAND: Absolutely
25	MR. BAKOTA: You know, the marsh and the

other areas. I want to ask you, you know that north/south branch, you know, that we want to remediate?

MR. IRELAND: This portion here (indicating)?

MR. BAKOTA: Yes. That's narrower there. I

notice there's more velocity, you know, there, and
do you think a lot of that is already washed out

of there as compared to the slower part of the

MR. WESCOTT: We'll know shortly.

MR. IRELAND: We'll know after we get the study done. It's my personal opinion that, yeah, I think there's not going to be a whole lot of stuff that's in there because I think anything that's been in there has been carried out.

MR. WESCOTT: We're hoping -- we've done some field measurements and we were dropping tapes off the bridges on 151st and Chicago and Columbus -- is it Columbus? Columbus. And it wasn't as deep as I was hoping. Maybe we were hitting the top of a car, but it was, you know, four to six feet; and I was hoping it was going to be deeper. And the velocity, we notice the velocity is really strong at 151st right where the two branches come together and shoot through. Then it doesn't seem to be as fast as you get farther down the channel,

but that's the -- the bathymetric survey will tell us how deep the sediment is below the water surface, and we're kind of hoping it gets deeper in the Indiana Harbor Canal because then maybe we just have to put sand in the bottom to cover it up and that gives a habitat for organisms but you don't have to spend a lot of money digging it out because it's already deep enough. But if it's too shallow, we'll have to.

MR. BAKOTA: Will there be a membrane also in there, or no?

MR. IRELAND: If the contamination is not that bad, we'll have to model it, but in some cases, sand will be sufficient to block anything from coming up. The stuff we're dealing with now on the east and west branch, the contamination was a lot higher, and we needed organic material, whether in a mat or membrane or in bulk form, that trapped or slowed down the contamination moving upward. If in that area there's not that much, we may be able, like Jim said, be able to throw a layer of sand down and that will be sufficient to start the habitat for coming in.

MR. WESCOTT: A lot of that will sort itself out in the fall after we collect the data, kind of

know what we really have, and then kind of sort through, and then we'll refine it some more in the design phase.

MR. FEKETE: We look forward to your results.

MR. IRELAND: We do, too. I'm excited about this and what you're talking about with there's this pent up aggression that everybody wants to move forward with things, I want to tap into that and make sure that we harness that as opposed to not hear what everybody has got to say. So if you're aware of something, bring it to my attention. We can make sure that we always keep things in mind. There's certain things we can't do under the law, certain things we can, so we'll just make sure that we understand what we've got and then try to incorporate everything we can.

MR. BAKOTA: What's good about it, I mean, the public will be able to use that river. They haven't used it in probably 120 years, you know.

MR. WESCOTT: Like Roxanna we did a couple years ago. It's amazing how many people are walking out there now. You can see the river.

MR. BAKOTA: It looks great compared to what it was. You know, you go up there, squint your eyes, you think you're up north somewhere.

1	MR. IRELAND: We had some people come to the
2	public availability session after that that said,
3	When I was a little kid, we used to come out here,
4	and you just didn't want to drive by. Now we want
5	to go there.
6	MR. LOPEZ: I agree with John because when we
7	were trying like this, and they're so serious,
8	and we put so much time into it, and you guys are
9	going for it, everybody wants to get on it, but I
10	hope it doesn't everybody gets on it and it
11	bogs down.
12	MR. IRELAND: Not going to let that happen.
13	MR. LOPEZ: Have good ideas and try and get
14	it all
15	MR. IRELAND: Exactly Exactly
16	MR. LOPEZ: Yeah.
17	MR. IRELAND: So we're not going to try to
18	make sure that everything, you know, we have to
19	just wait and wait, and wait to get all these good
20	ideas, and we are going to move forward, and we
21	have a pretty good schedule.
22	MR. WESCOTT: And he's not lagging. He is
23	just moving at a methodical pace.
24	MR. BAKOTA: It's good to see you get along
25	so far

MR. WESCOTT: We've gotten along for less years. I'll be here every month, but, you know, Fernando -- we're talking every week.

MR. FEKETE: Okay. The next order of business is the Army Corps of Engineers' report.

MS. MILL: Natalie Mills, with the U.S. Army
Corps of Engineers. The contractor is scheduled
-- let me step back. The contractor is currently
mobilizing on site, and he is scheduled to start
dredging on Monday, which is the 21st of April.
So that's still on schedule, and hopefully the
weather is going to cooperate, and it shouldn't be
a problem anymore.

Fernando, we do need to coordinate the tour: We tried to do the tour last year. We were unsuccessful, so we should try to propose some dates again. Hopefully, before Colonel Drummond moves on, you know, he'll be moving on at the end of May, so maybe we can look at some dates in May. Just so you know, you all know we get a commander every three years, so his term is up.

MR. TREVINO: How should we do that Natalie? Should we give you two or three dates, or do you want to propose two or three dates?

MS. MILL: I guess I should probably give you
two or three dates and make sure they're
available.

MR. TREVINO: I think that's what we did last year. You gave us a few dates for consideration, and then I went to the board with it. I think that's easier than the other way around, because it will be dependent on, on -- well, it sounds like not just the Corps' dredging but Colonel Drumond.

MS. MILL: Yes, because he never was able to get out on the boat. So that was something he wanted to do.

The next item I have is the retrofit, and so that's the main entrance ramp repair, and that work is scheduled to be done, which is just placing some concrete and it should be done this spring.

CDF documentation: We did submit the TSCA permit on the 27th of March to the regulatory agencies and to ECWMD. So that period of review was a year, so I don't expect to hear much any time soon, but there will be a public meeting at some point, and they'll let us know when that's going to be -- or schedule with us

when that's going to be.

Oil boom coordination: Our contractor is coordinating the movement of the oil boom across Indianapolis Boulevard, and we did get notice from Paul Johnson today that the boom has been removed. So we'll be prepared to come through -- or the contractor will be prepared to come through on Monday.

The PCA and nonfederal funding: I don't have anything on the PCA. I'll allow Attorney Ellen Gregory to update. As Fernando indicated, we do have a proposed meeting date on the appraisal on the 29th of April. I can set up a time and send out a conference call number to everyone.

I previously requested a date for ECWMD with Ellen and Fernando to meet with the Corps' cost share team so we can talk about credits. So just let me know when you guys have some dates.

MR. TREVINO: If we could meet after this meeting, just so we have since we're all here.

MS. MILL: Okay. Sure: Indianapolis parkway improvements: We did receive the authorization for entry from ECWMD, and right now we're awaiting

our stone delivery, so we have a request for 1 2 proposal out, and so we're waiting on proposals from contractors, and then we'll be able to schedule a delivery date for the stone. And then we can -- once we know when the material is coming, then we can plan some dates. MR. LOPEZ: We got a guy that watches everything.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. MILL: Okay. Good. We did send out a request for you guys to fill out the customer Let us know how we're doing. So that is survey. due tomorrow. So if you have an opportunity to give some feedback --

MR. TREVINO: We reviewed it and I'll be submitting something tonight.

MS. MILLS: I know it will be amazing. Thank Thank you in advance. Whatever feedback, you know, we appreciate feedback from all sponsors, so if you guys are available to, we appreciate you get that in.

And I did receive the public meeting presentation. I know, Ellen, you had asked for me to provide that in the past. So I need to put it on a disk. So they put it on the drive and so I've got to put it on some disk of some

sort, or if I can coordinate with you on how to 1 do that. 2 MS. GREGORY: I use Dropbox, but I know you 3 guys can't, so a disk is fine. 5 MS. MILLS: No, I can't download that MS. GREGORY: 6 Right. 7 MS. MILLS: That's all I have at this time. MR. FEKETE: Any questions for Natalie? 8 9 (No response.) 10 MR. FEKETE: Thank you very much. 11 MS. MILLS: Thank you. 12 MR. FEKETE: Next order, Attorney Ellen 13 Gregory report. 14 MS GREGORY: Ellen Gregory, with Ellen 15 Gregory Law. I'm just going to whiz through some of these items that I have here. 16 The consent The latest version was distributed by the 17 decree: 18 Department of Justice attorney in late January. Fernando and I have met a couple of times to go 19 20 through that. We submitted some preliminary comments to the Department of Justice attorney 21 22 about two weeks ago and are working on finalizing 23 our comments and then we'll be having a call with the Department of Justice lawyer to go through 24 those with him. One of the main concerns is that 25

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

the new version of the consent decree has identified the Waterway Management District as a party who is responsible for performing the work on the RISF, which originally BP was supposed to be on the hook for. So that's our main concern that we're going to address with the DOJ lawyer and the other lawyers in the group.

On real estate matters, the Feddeler claim continues to move forward. Our real estate lawyer, Jim Wieser, has been doing a lot of work on looking through title documents, and we've had phone conversations with the Army Corps of Engineers' real estate lawyer to go over the Feddeler claim and whether or not the interest in the real property is actually a fee interest or a right of way. So we're proceeding on that. I've also been working with Mirca Blessich (phonetic), who is the real estate advisor, to try to put together a summary of the easements, other rights-of-way, and other documents that relate to all of the Waterway Management District parcels and will have, hopefully, a finalized summary of that by the next board meeting.

The PCA, we have had a brief discussion

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

with Army Corps about revisions to the original 2000 PCA. We continue to -- Fernando and I are looking at the options that have been presented, and we'll be putting together something for the board to review next month, and then hopefully shortly thereafter to respond to the Corps. And, as Mr. Trevino mentioned, we are trying to set up meetings with the Corps on the various PCA credit items, which include the appraisal of the CDF parcel, as well as the local costs that have been incurred to date; and in conjunction with that, the meeting with the Corps' financial people hopefully will move us forward in that a little bit.

And then finally on the user fees: We will be looking at non-payers. The user fees are due April 1st, and so we'll be looking at the non-payers who haven't paid by about May 1st and deciding how to proceed with the Attorney General's office and enforcing against those non-payers. That's all I have. Does anybody have any questions?

MR. FEKETE: Any questions for Miss Gregory?

(No response.)

MR. FEKETE: Thank you very much. Any new 1 business to come before the board? Other 2 business? 3 (No response.) 4 MR. FEKETE: Just to bring everybody up to 5 date on the current state of affairs, there will 6 be a meeting on April 22 at 10:00 at the Indiana 7 Department of Environmental Management's northwest 8 9 regional office to discuss the status of the Jeorse Park project. Mr. Lopez and I are planning 10 on attending that meeting and we will dully report 11 12 out at the next meeting. Right now -- yes. 13 MR. IRELAND: I'm sorry. What was the date 14 of that? 15 MR. FEKETE: That's 10:00 on April 22nd will report out what we learn at that meeting. 16 17 Right now we have not heard much from Michigan State, but we've not been asked for any financial 18 19 support, so we'll see where we are on that particular day. Any other business? 20 21 (No response.) MR. FEKETE: Hearing none, our next board 22 23 meeting -- any public comments? 24 (No response.) 25 MR FEKETE: No comments from the public.

1	Our next board meeting will be May 21, 2014, at
2	5:00 in this office, or in this building
3	Entertain a motion of adjournment?
4	MR. BAKOTA: Motion to adjourn.
5	MR. FEKETE: Second?
6	MR. RODRIGUEZ: Second
7	MR. FEKETE: All in favor, signify by saying
8	aye
9	(All signify aye.)
10	MR FEKETE: We are adjourned
11	PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED.
12	_ * _
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

CERTIFICATE

I, Dawn M. Iseminger, Registered Professional Reporter (RPR), and Notary Public within and for the County of Porter, State of Indiana, do hereby certify that I appeared at The City of East Chicago, Engineering/Annex Building, 4444 Railroad Avenue, East Chicago, Indiana, on the 16th day of April, 2014, to report the proceedings had of the District Board of Directors' Meeting.

I further certify that I then and there reported in machine shorthand the proceedings given at said time and place, and that the testimony was then reduced to typewriting from my original shorthand notes, and the foregoing transcript consisting of thirty-eight (38) pages is a true and accurate record of said proceedings had.

Dated this 15th day of May, 2014.

From M. Wennigh

2.5

Dawn M. Iseminger, RPR
My Commission expires: 7/22/2017